REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 8, and 12 to further clarify the invention. Further, claims 15-20 have been added which are clearly supported throughout the specification. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-6, and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,977,654 to Johnson *et al.* ("Johnson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,292 to Onuma *et al.* ("Onuma").

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Onuma and further in view of U.S. Patent No, 6,275,141 to Walter (hereinafter "Walter").

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Onuma, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,760,680 to Hwang (hereinafter "Hwang").

For *at least* the following reasons, this rejection is traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable over the references. For example, claim 1 recites a burglarproof device for a vehicle. The burglarproof device comprises, *inter alia*, an activation unit for the vehicle which receives a first ID code from a portable transmitter and collates the first ID code with a prestored second ID code, such that a locked state of a vehicle operation device for the

vehicle is released when the activation unit receives the first ID code. The burglarproof device further comprises an engine operation restraining unit which disables an engine operation based on a signal from the activation unit, wherein the signal from the activation unit is sent after the vehicle device has been released in response to the receipt of the first ID code by the activation unit. The signal to disable the engine operation is sent by the activation unit if a time period between the release of the vehicle operation device by the activation unit and a detection of a start of the engine operation exceeds a first time period.

The Examiner contends that the control portion 28 of the anti-theft system 26 in Johnson discloses the activation unit and the engine operation restraining unit as set forth in claim 1 (see Johnson: figures 1 and 2). Although the Examiner admits that Johnson does not disclose that the signal from the activation unit is sent after the vehicle device has been released in response to the receipt of the first ID code by the activation unit, the Examiner relies on Onuma for this feature. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the transmission of a door unlock ID prior to the transmission of a starting engine ID code by a wireless electronic key 20 discloses this above-noted feature. However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Johnson or Onuma disclose the features of claim 1 is as complete detail as set forth in the claim.

For instance, Johnson and Onuma, alone or in any conceivable combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest that the signal to disable the engine operation is sent by the activation unit if a time period between the release of the vehicle operation device by the activation unit and a detection of a start of the engine operation exceeds a first time period. Since the Examiner admits that Johnson does not disclose that the signal for disabling the engine operation is sent

after the vehicle operation device has been released, it is clear that the teachings of Johnson are deficient to carry out the above-noted feature of claim 1.

Onuma is directed to improving an electronic key system for a vehicle which executes a door unlocking function based on a comparison result between a first ID code received from a portable electronic key and a registered ID code in the system, and subsequently executes an engine starting function based on a comparison result between a second ID code received from a portable electronic key and another registered ID code in the system (*see* Onuma: Abstract, col. 1, lines 35-51). Onuma's invention improves the above system by requiring *only a part of the second ID* (*compact second ID*) from the portable electronic key in order to execute the engine starting function if the comparison result between the first ID and the registered ID is stored in memory. The compact second ID would only be compared with a compact part of the another registered ID in the system of Onuma for verification purposes to permit the execution of the engine starting function. Since the portable electronic key only transmits the *compact* second ID and the comparison is only made between the compact second ID and a compact version of the another registered ID in the system, Onuma states that this method shortens the processing time for verification/authentication of the driver (*see* Onuma: Abstract, col. 1, lines 13-35, col. 4, lines 50-67, and col. 5, lines 17-30).

During the above-described operations, Onuma discloses that if a driver attempts to start a vehicle by turning on the ignition key, an on-wheel vehicle apparatus 1 checks to see whether the first ID code is stored in a memory of the apparatus 1 (Onuma, figures 8A-8B, operations S11-S12, col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 3). That is, the apparatus checks to see whether the driver

has previously sent a door unlock request with a complete first ID via an electronic key 20 and whether the request was successful (Onuma, figures 7A-7B, operations S4-S7, col. 6, lines 22-51). Depending on whether the first ID code is stored or not, the apparatus 1 prompts the electronic key 20 to send an engine start signal with either a compacted second ID or the complete second ID (Onuma, figures 8A-8B, and 9A-9B, operations S12-S13 and S21).

Here, Onuma discloses that the apparatus 1 "checks for a predetermined time period whether on-vehicle apparatus 1 has received the engine start request signal and the compacted second ID" or the complete second ID code (Onuma, figures 8A and 9A, operations S16 and S24, col. 7, lines 23-27, col. 8, lines 44-47). That is, the predetermined time period is measured from a time when the apparatus 1 prompts the electronic key 20 to send the engine start signal and a compact or complete version of the second ID code. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites that the time period is between the release of the vehicle operation device by the activation unit and a detection of a start of the engine operation.

Onuma's predetermined time period begins from the time the apparatus 1 prompts the electronic key 20 to send the engine start signal (figures 8A and 9A, operations S13 and S21), and not from a time when the doors are unlocked (figure 7A, S7). Accordingly, the "time period" of claim 1 is different from the predetermined time period disclosed by Onuma.

Furthermore, Hwang, which was applied in the rejection of claim 7, discloses a vehicle security device that initiates counters provided so as to arm the vehicle security device. In particular, Hwang discloses two counters:

1) A 10 minute counter that will start counting when the ignition is turned off (Hwang, col. 2, lines 6-8).

2) A 30 second counter which starts counting if all the doors of the car are closed (Hwang, col. 2, lines 32-34).

As such, Hwang does not disclose or suggest any counter that has a time period between the release of the vehicle operation device by the activation unit and a detection of a start of the engine operation exceeds a first time period. On the contrary, Hwang discloses that the 30-second counter stops counting if the vehicle door is opened while the 30-second counter is active (Hwang, col. 2, lines 39-42).

Additionally, since the Examiner did not respond to the arguments submitted in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on May 22, 2007 in the Advisory Action, Applicants incorporate herein those arguments by reference. The arguments in the previous Amendment set forth reasons as to why the incorporation of teachings of Onuma into the device of Johnson would render Johnson's device inoperable.

In light of the discussion above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-3

Since claims 2-3 depend upon claim 1 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit claims 2-3 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Onuma and further in view of U.S. Patent No, 6,275,141 to Walter (hereinafter "Walter").

Since claim 4 depends upon claim 1, and since Walter does not cure the deficient teachings of Johnson and Onuma with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable *at least* by virtue of its dependency.

Claims 5-6

Since claims 5-6 depend upon claim 1 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5-6 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 7

Applicants submit that since claim 7 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection thereto is rendered moot.

Claims 8-11

Since claims 8-11 depend upon claim 1 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-11 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 12-14

Claim 12 recites features analogous to those given above with respect to claim 1, i.e., claim 12 recites a method for preventing a burglary in a vehicle comprising, *inter alia*, collating the first ID received by the receiver with a prestored second ID code prestored in the receiver, such that a locked state of a vehicle operation device for the vehicle is released when the receiver receives the first ID code; and *disabling an engine operation based on a signal representing a result of the collation*, wherein the signal representing the result is sent *after the vehicle*

operation device has been released in response to the received first ID code. The signal to disable the engine operation is sent by the activation unit if a time period between the release of the vehicle operation device by the activation unit and a detection of a start of the engine operation exceeds a first time period. Therefore, claim 12 is patentable for *at least* reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 1.

Since claims 13-14 depend upon claim 12 which has been shown to contain patentable subject matter above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13-14 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

New claims

New claims 15-20 have been added to further define the invention. Claims 15-16 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 12.

Claims 17 and 19 are patentable *at least* for reciting that the transmission of the preset first ID code by the portable transmitter to the activation unit is a final communication between the portable transmitter and the activation unit that causes the activation unit to release the vehicle operation device and that causes the activation unit to send the signal to the engine operation restraining unit to disable the engine operation.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Onuma discloses that the on-vehicle apparatus 1 prompts the electronic key 20 to send a request for starting the engine (Onuma, figure 8A, operation S13) after the electronic key 20 has transmitted the first complete ID requesting to unlock the door (Onuma, figure 7B, operation S4). Therefore, the transmission of the first complete ID from the electronic key 20 is not the final communication between the

electronic key 20 and the on-vehicle apparatus 1 that causes the on-vehicle apparatus 1 to terminate the engine start process, rather it is the signal from the on-vehicle apparatus 1 prompting the electronic key 20 to request an engine start (Onuma, figure 8A, operation S13) that is the final signal that results in the termination of the engine start process (Onuma, figures 8A and 9A, operations S16 -NO and S24 - NO, col. 8, lines 51-56).

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 19 are patentable over the prior art.

Since claims 18 and 20 depend from claims 17 and 19, respectively, Applicants submit that claims 18 and 20 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 22, 2007